

**REMARKS**

Careful consideration has been given to the office action, and the Applicants request reconsideration in light of the amendments to the claims and specification.

The Examiner objected to subject matter in claims 15 through 18 and 25 through 28. The language of those claims have been added to page 14 of the application as indicated. No new matter arises here.

The Examiner indicated allowability of Claims 7 through 12 and these claims have been amended to be an independent format and accordingly should be allowable.

Other changes of the may to the claims to meet projections under section 112 parent paragraph claims to 17, 18, 27 and 28 when not rejected over art. Accordingly these claims have been written in independent format and should be allowable.

Additionally the contents of claim 17 and 18 and alternative format language have been added to claims 1, 3, 19, 29, 39, 49, 59, 69, 78, 89, 99, 109, 121, 133, 159, 169, 202. In view of this is submitted that these claims also allowable. As used in claim 1 for instance, an "admission pass" may be either for the admission to a group of attractions as a whole or to a particular attraction within a larger attraction group.

Claims 207 and 208 are new. Claim 207 is based on original claim 1 with the addition of the contents of claim 7. Is submitted that these claims also allowable.

Claim 30 is written in independent format and is directed to the requirement that the assigned time **must** be the next available time. A similar requirement is set out in claim 40, 50, 60, 79, 110 122, 134, 170, and 181. These claims have been rejected based on the allegation by the Examiner that the feature was inherent to the generation of next available time. The basis for the rejection was the reference Waytena. The Applicants respectfully rebut that rejection. The Examiner has apparently not taken consideration of the word **must**. These claims emphatically give no option to which time is going to be assigned. It can in no way be considered that the

prior art inherently mandates that the next time **must** be the one assigned. With this explanation it is believed that the Examiner would agree that these claims are distinguishable over the cited art, and are thus allowable.

Claims 145 and 152 have the requirement of determining whether a customer has any outstanding assigned future times. This is clearly not disclosed, taught or suggested any of the cited art and hence it is submitted that this claim is also allowable. The Examiner cited the reference of Waytena to teach that reservations may be based on the needs of the customer. This is not what claims 145 and 152 have amended (to include the contents of claim 149 and 156 respectively) are claiming. As amended these claims clarify that the issuance of further access to the second queue is possible if there are no outstanding assigned future times. In other words this is under the control of the management as opposed to the needs of the customer.

Claim 192 less been amended to indicate that they issued media has informational material similar to claim 1 as now amended. Accordingly claim 192 is also allowable.

Many of the dependent claims have been changed in the dependencies to depend from claims which is submitted to be allowable. Accordingly it is submitted that all those dependent claims also allowable.

An IDS citing art which the Applicants have become aware is attached together with the art as appropriate.

In view of the above it is submitted that the present application is in good order for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited. Should matters remain which the Examiner believes can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call the Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Any additional fees required in connection with this communication which are not specifically provided for herewith are authorized to be charged to the Deposit Account No. 50-1561 in the name of Greenberg Traurig LLP. Any overpayments are also authorized to be credited to this account. Any extensions of time that are necessary for this paper, or any

extensions of time that will be required for papers to be submitted in this case in the future, are hereby generally requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 11, 2003

*Margo Maddux*

Margo Maddux  
Reg. No. 50,962

Customer Number 33717  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400E  
Santa Monica, CA 90404  
Phone: (310) 586-7827  
Fax: (310) 586-7800  
E-mail: madduxm@gtlaw.com



33717  
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

\\LA-SRV01\194819v02